

has become one of the great evils of our time and country, and, moreover, the stumbling-stone in the way of the liquor-traffic. Commercial men tell us that it is impossible to carry on their business without asking their customers "to have a drink." Refuse a person offering to treat and you are considered as exceedingly religious, or at least unsociable. Now, although "we are all creatures of habit" (in the opinion of one of Dickens' characters), it is high time for us to rebel against the authority of this lord when he exercises such an evil rule over commerce and society as he does at the present day.

The question then arises: What is the best way of overthrowing the rule of this destructive habit? As a preface to the answer, let us remember that, in removing an evil, we must infringe upon the rights of men as little as possible. Further, I will grant both these statements: I will grant that the juice of the grape, fermented or unfermented, used in moderation, is wholesome, and also that our Saviour on one occasion turned water into wine; and yet I affirm that there exist at the present day certain abuses of the drinking habits which justify us in using extraordinary means to save our fellow-men.

If liquor-dealers had had foresight and prudence, they might have prevented this crusade against their traffic, by adopting measures to raise its standard. They have endangered their own cause by allowing certain dealers to violate the laws in force—not only the written laws of our land, but what we might call the common law of humanity. These laws are being broken every day by those short-sighted members of the liquor-guild, and theirs is the blame if the whole body has to suffer loss.

A SUPPORTER OF THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT.

[The habit of "treating" has already been condemned by THE WEEK. Let it by all means be abolished. But, as was objected on a former occasion, surely in such a community as ours there must be moral force enough to do this without the sinister aid of a sumptuary Act of Parliament. The fact is the system is already declining under the growing influence of morality and good sense.—ED.]

#### THE SCOTT ACT CONTROVERSY.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—A correspondent, in a recent issue, would dispose of the Scriptural evidence by intimating that Christ would not in this our day sanction the sale of wines, etc. It is fortunate for Christianity and Christian people that the will of God was the same then as it was in the beginning and is to-day. There is no great difficulty in ascertaining how we ought to live so as to please God. It is in professing a desire to please God, but in reality caring more how they please man, that men err. Christ lived so as to please God. In His time there were wine drinkers, and even drunkards. But we do not learn that Christ advocated human laws restricting or prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors. He did not even try moral suasion to induce man to abandon the use of wine. On the contrary, He made, blessed, and drank it. It is not related as an historical fact that the man who fell among thieves between Jerusalem and Jericho was rescued from death by the good Samaritan, who used both oil and wine, and took him to an inn to be well cared for. As a parallel, however, the neighbourly acts and kindness of the good Samaritan as approved of by Christ are far more instructive to us, as illustrating what Christ would do in contrast with what we might expect from our Scott Act friend under similar circumstances.

If Christ had not plucked the ears of corn on the Sabbath day He would not have committed an offence against the Jewish law. But His defence is a lasting rebuke to those who for the appearance of righteousness would have sacrifice and not mercy. The example of Christ's teaching is worthy of a better following. Adultery was no greater or less a sin when Christ was on the earth than it is to-day. Drunkenness is not so vile. "Go and sin no more" was the holy Preacher's advice to the condemned woman. He shirked not the duties of His holy office, nor sought, as a substitute for patient teaching and the working of the Spirit, the power of a magistrate and the penalties of an unjust law. Our Scott Act friend professes humanity, and deplores drunkenness and its attendant evils, but thinks he is serving the cause of Christ by advocating a law that will punish a man for doing that which is in itself no sin against God. His mistaken zeal will not abate with the passing of the Scott Act, because he will have sacrifice, not mercy. He will delight in the punishment of the offenders; nor is it unreasonable to expect that he will little care if the evils attending the enforcement of the Scott Act penalties may be greater than the evils attending the offence. Men will drink wine as long as God gives the juice of the grape. And I for one believe that if the Scott Act is passed in every county the very penalties of the law to be enforced will cause its destruction in good time. But the advocates of this law will do well to pause and consider how far they invite this class of legislation. The clergymen ought especially to take heed. If we are to go back to the days of intolerance, and endeavour to prohibit sin by the power of a magistrate, the Church itself may not escape.

Hamilton, June, 1885.

Yours, etc., GEO. FRED. JELFS.

#### REVENUE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—In your remarks last week upon the revenues of the Church of England you lend your weight to that popular fallacy that the Church (in England) is "paid by the State." The Church of England derives her support from three sources—tithes, endowments and voluntary contributions. That the last of these, though coming, perhaps, mainly from the wealthy, forms no insignificant part of her revenue, may be seen from the fact that, in London alone, there were, at the time of the last census, 1,961 clergy and only 690 benefices, so that 1,134 clergymen in London were supported by voluntary contributions. The endowments, whether ancient or modern, are the gifts of bishops and wealthy laymen, while the tithes, which, in any case, go but a short way towards the support of the Church, are incumbrances voluntarily placed upon their estates by the original owners of them, or imposed upon them when the estates were first granted; and so tithes and endowments are no more the property of the State than is any piece of land owned by a private individual. When a short time ago the question was put to several of the leading statesmen: "Are the bishops and clergy of the Church of England State paid?" Mr. Gladstone replied: "The clergy of the Church of England are not State paid," while Lord Salisbury answered: "The bishops receive no grant from the State, but they receive a revenue from ancient endowments given to the Church," and Lord Granville: "Tithes existed in England before Acts of Parliament, though the present mode of assessment and payment was settled by the Tithes Commutation Act, 6 and 7 William IV., c. 49, and subsequent statutes."

With this correction the rest of your remark is very just, that "the Church of England probably always finds it more difficult than do other churches to collect voluntary contributions, because her people, if they are emigrants from England"—and we have most of us been that in our time—"have been always accustomed to a church" to the support of which they have not been called upon themselves to contribute. Yours, etc., T. W. P.

[It is surely impossible to deny that compulsory tithe is an impost levied under the authority of the State, or that a church mainly supported by it is paid by the State, whatever other sources of revenue it may have.—ED.]

#### REVENUES OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—The Rev. R. Harrison in his letter to you denies that there is any falling off in the revenues of the Anglican Church, and asserts that on the contrary there is an increase of \$25,000. It is difficult to reconcile this with his letter to the *Globe* of June 19, in which he distinctly admitted that there was a falling off, but affirmed that it was only momentary and deprecated "the drawing of inferences as to Church retrogression and decay from the exceptional and transient deficit of one year."

If there is no falling off, and no financial emergency, why are we exhorted to have recourse to the system of Voluntary Tithe?

ANGLICAN.

#### THE DEATH-BED OF LOUIS THE ELEVENTH.

Son of Valois! tell to the world what power avails thee now!  
Death's icy touch is on thy heart, his dews are on thy brow.  
Whence comes the hue of mortal dread that pales thy withered cheek?  
Has sleeping conscience waked at last? Speak, sceptred monster, speak!  
When fell thy victims' parting groans coldly impassive thou;  
The scene has chang'd; what sayest then, O dying tyrant, now?  
Death, through long years thy vassal slave, is lord o'er thee at last,  
And 'midst his train of horrors troop the shadows of the Past.  
La Balue comes from living death, from Loche's circled fate,  
Terror has stayed where Mercy failed—long years of venom'd hate;  
Guienne, fair offspring of thy royal mother's womb,  
Points his dead hand at thee, O king, from his unhallowed tomb.  
Unshriven he died. Men thought him sped by fell disease undone;  
What of the secret chalice and the Abbot of St. John?  
At yonder feast was the mad jester's tale denied,  
Heir of the Sainted Capet's throne, illustrious fratricide?  
Ha! see'st yon spectral form that gibbers from the outer gloom  
Girt with St. Denis cerements—the odours of the tomb?  
Fling back the arras wider still. Rememb'rest thou that glance,  
When he was the Most Christian King, and thou a Child of France?  
Aye! leprous soul! 'tis he—thy sire; his pilgrimage below  
Shortened by thee, his son—his son, yet most relentless foe.  
When pealed the tocsin's hateful call to foul seditious strife,  
Who raised the standard of Revolt against a father's life?  
Who, pardoned by a father's love, revived the Praguerie?  
What skills to ask thee who: thy dastard heart impeacheth thee.  
Beneath yon grey embattled walls there sleeps till doom beguiled  
Armagnac's ill-starred consort and her butchered unborn-child.  
Lectour! no darker tale than thine on history's tarnished page;  
A ravished truce, a poisoned cup, and a king's insatiate rage.  
And one with blood-stained mitre lends this hour a crimson hue,  
Whose solemn accents brand thee with the hireling Flemish crew.  
Bourbon! Prince-Bishop of Liège, loved prelate of "The Bold,"  
Lays his dark murder at the door of France's secret gold.  
Hark! Blending with the voice of prayer, the chapel organ's tones,  
There comes from 'neath these very walls the wail of captive groans.  
There hopeless ones in gloom still pass their nigh forgotten lives  
(Peace! suffering hearts! a despot's death shall rend your rusting gyves).  
Throne of thy sire, well served in love, thine by mean slavish fear,  
His service won by kingly smiles, thine by the orphan's tear.  
Towards dark Plessis' terrace plies no more the homeward wing,  
For tears and blood hold daily tryst in the garden of the king.  
Foul carrion throng the royal chase where voice of song is mute  
(Rare haunt for carrion where each bough bears hideous human fruit).  
Mumble thy prayers to Her of Clery now; call loud to Her;  
E'en she, thy patroness, is deaf to-night, O whited sepulchre!  
Craven! there is no peace. Unheeded now each frenzied call;  
A greater tyrant e'en than thou holds thy black heart in thrall.  
Fainter and fainter fall thy shrieks beneath the avenging rod;  
Son of Valois, France leaves thee here to conscience and thy God.

H. K. COCKIN.

#### A RIVIERE OF DIAMONDS.

[Translated from the French for THE WEEK.]

SHE was one of those pretty and charming women on whose visiting cards a somewhat cruel fate had written "*née bourgeoisie*," without fortune, opportunities, ways and means of becoming known, appreciated, loved, wooed and wedded by some wealthy and distinguished man; and so she gave her hand to a subordinate clerk in the office of the Minister of Public Instruction. Her beauty went unadorned for the simple reason that the adorning of it was out of the question. Nevertheless she grieved over this in the spirit of a princess denied her legitimate right to luxury and soft living.